

Environment and Energy Injection Effects in GRB Afterglows

Z. G. Dai and T. Lu

Department of Astronomy, Nanjing University, Nanjing 210093, China

ABSTRACT

In a recent paper (Dai & Lu 1999), we have proposed a simple model in which the steepening in the light curve of the R-band afterglow of the gamma-ray burst (GRB) 990123 is caused by the adiabatic shock which has evolved from an ultrarelativistic phase to a nonrelativistic phase in a dense medium. We find that such a model is quite consistent with observations if the medium density is about $3 \times 10^6 \text{ cm}^{-3}$. Here we discuss this model in more details. In particular, we investigate the effects of synchrotron self absorption and energy injection. A shock in a dense medium becomes nonrelativistic rapidly after a short relativistic phase. The afterglow from the shock at the nonrelativistic stage decays more rapidly than at the relativistic stage. Since some models for GRB energy sources predict that a strongly magnetic millisecond pulsar may be born during the formation of GRB, we discuss the effect of such a pulsar on the evolution of the nonrelativistic shock through magnetic dipole radiation. We find that after the energy which the shock obtains from the pulsar is much more than the initial energy of the shock, the afterglow decay will flatten significantly. When the pulsar energy input effect disappears, the decay will steepen again. These features are in excellent agreement with the afterglows of GRB 980519, GRB 990510 and GRB 980326. Furthermore, our model fits very well all the observational data of GRB 980519 including the last two detections.

Subject headings: gamma-rays: bursts – stars: pulsars – shock waves

1. INTRODUCTION

In the standard afterglow shock model (for a review see Piran 1999), a gamma-ray burst (GRB) afterglow is usually believed to be produced by synchrotron radiation or inverse Compton scattering in an ultrarelativistic shock wave expanding in a homogeneous medium. As more and more ambient matter is swept up, the shock gradually decelerates while the emission from such a shock fades down, dominating at the beginning in X-rays and progressively at optical to radio energy band. In this model, there are two limiting cases (adiabatic and highly radiative) for hydrodynamical evolution of a relativistic shock. These cases have been well studied both analytically (e.g., Mészáros & Rees 1997; Wijers, Rees & Mészáros 1997; Waxman 1997a, b; Reichart 1997; Sari 1997; Vietri 1997; Katz & Piran 1997; Sari, Piran & Narayan 1998; etc) and numerically (e.g., Panaitescu, Mészáros & Rees 1998; Huang et al. 1998; Huang, Dai & Lu 1998). A partially radiative (intermediate) case has been investigated (Chiang & Dermer 1998; Cohen, Piran & Sari 1998; Dai, Huang & Lu 1999; Huang, Dai & Lu 1999a). All the studies are based on the following basic assumptions: (1) the total energy of the shock is released impulsively before its formation; (2) the medium swept up by the shock is homogeneous and its density (n) is the one of the interstellar medium $\sim 1 \text{ cm}^{-3}$; and (3) the electron and magnetic field energy fractions of the shocked medium and the index (p) in the accelerated electrons' power-law distribution are constant during the whole evolution stage. The standard model is successful at explaining the overall features of late afterglows of some bursts such as GRB 970508: the light curves behave according to a single unbroken power law with decay index of $\alpha \sim -1$ as long as the observations continued (Zharikov et al. 1998).

Each of these assumptions has been varied to discuss why some observed afterglows deviate from that expected by the standard afterglow model. For example, the R-band light curve of GRB 970508 afterglow peaks around two days after the burst, and there is a rather rapid rise before the peak which is followed by a long power-law decay. There are two models explaining this special feature: (i) Rees and Mészáros (1998) envisioned that

a postburst fireball may contain shells with a continuous distribution of Lorentz factors. As the external forward shock sweeps up ambient matter and decelerates, internal shells will catch up with the shock and supply energy into it. A detailed calculation shows that this model can explain well this special feature (Panaitescu, Mészáros and Rees 1998). (ii) Dai & Lu (1998a) considered continuous energy injection from a strongly magnetized millisecond pulsar into the shock through magnetic dipole radiation. This model can also account for well the observations. It is very clear that these models don't use basic assumption (1).

There are several models in the literature that discuss the effect of inhomogeneous media on afterglows (Dai & Lu 1998b; Mészáros, Rees & Wijers 1998; Vietri 1997), dropping the second assumption. Generally, an $n \propto r^{-k}$ ($k > 0$) medium is expected to steepen an afterglow's temporal decay. Recently, Chevalier & Li (1999a, b) found that a Wolf-Rayet star wind likely leads to an $n \propto r^{-2}$ medium, and thus if GRB 980519 resulted from the explosion of such a massive star, subsequent evolution of a relativistic shock in this medium is consistent with the steep decay in the R-band light curve of the afterglow from this burst. Another way of dropping the second assumption is that the density of an ambient medium is invoked to be as high as $n \sim 10^6 \text{ cm}^{-3}$. Recent observations show that the temporal decay of the R-band afterglow of GRB 990123 steepened about 2.5 days after this burst (Kulkarni et al. 1999; Castro-Tirado et al. 1999; Fruchter et al. 1999). Dai & Lu (1999) (hereafter DL99) proposed a plausible model in which a shock expanding in a dense medium has evolved from a relativistic phase to a nonrelativistic phase. They found that this model fits well the observational data if the medium density is about $3 \times 10^6 \text{ cm}^{-3}$. They further suggested that such a medium could be a supernova or supranova or hypernova ejecta. Of course, the steepening in the light curves of the afterglows of these two bursts may be due to lateral spreading of a jet, as analyzed by Rhoads (1999) and Sari, Piran & Halpern (1999). However, numerical studies of Panaitescu & Mészáros (1999), Moderski, Sikora & Bulik (1999), Huang et al. (1999b)

and Huang, Dai & Lu (2000) show that the break of the light curve is weaker and much smoother than the one analytically predicted when the light travel effects related to the lateral size of the jet and a realistic expression of the lateral expansion speed are taken into account.

In basic assumption (3), the electron and magnetic field energy fractions of the shocked medium may not be varied during whole evolution, as argued by Wang, Dai & Lu (1999a), who analyzed all the observational data including both the prompt optical flash and the afterglow of GRB 990123. However, the assumption that p is constant might be inconsistent with the early afterglow from GRB 970508 (Djorgovski et al. 1997).

In this paper, we discuss the model proposed by DL99 in more details, by taking into account both the synchrotron self-absorption effect in the shocked medium and the energy injection effect of Dai & Lu (1998a, c). Therefore, our present analysis, in fact, relaxes assumptions (1) and (2). So far the bursts whose afterglow decay steepens include GRB 980519, GRB 980326 and GRB 990510 besides GRB 990123. In particular, for the former two of these bursts, optical observations several days later are far above a power law decline, implying possible energy injection at such a late stage. In section 2, we analyze the spectrum and light curve of radiation from a shock expanding in a dense medium. In section 3, we compare our model with observations related to GRB 980519 and infer all intrinsic parameters and the redshift of this burst. We discuss properties of GRB 990510 and GRB 980326 in section 4, and in the final section we give a discussion and conclusion.

2. SHOCK EVOLUTION

2.1. *Relativistic Phase*

For simplicity, we assume that a relativistic shock expanding in a dense medium is adiabatic. The evolution of a partially radiative shock depends on both the efficiency with which the shock transfers its bulk kinetic energy to electrons and magnetic fields and on the efficiency with which the electrons radiate their energy (Dai, Huang & Lu

1999). Here we don't consider such a shock. The Blandford-McKee (1976) self similar solution gives the Lorentz factor of an adiabatic relativistic shock,

$$\gamma = \frac{1}{4} \left[\frac{17E_0(1+z)^3}{\pi n m_p c^5 t_\oplus^3} \right]^{1/8} = 1 E_{52}^{1/8} n_5^{-1/8} t_\oplus^{-3/8} [(1+z)/2]^{3/8}, \quad (1)$$

where $E_0 = E_{52} \times 10^{52} \text{ergs}$ is the total isotropic energy, $n_5 = n/10^5 \text{cm}^{-3}$, $t_\oplus$ is the observer's time since the gamma-ray trigger in units of 1 day, z is the redshift of the source generating this shock, and m_p is the proton mass. We assume $\gamma = 1$ when $t_\oplus = t_b$. This implies

$$n_5 = E_{52} t_b^{-3} [(1+z)/2]^3. \quad (2)$$

For $t_\oplus > t_b$, the shock will be in a nonrelativistic phase. In the following we will see different spectra and light curves from this shock before and after the time t_b . We first analyze the relativistic case.

As usual, only synchrotron radiation from the shock is considered. To analyze the spectrum and light curve, one needs to know three crucial frequencies: the synchrotron peak frequency (ν_m), the cooling frequency (ν_c), and the self-absorption frequency (ν_a). We assume a power law distribution of the electrons accelerated by the shock: $dn'_e/d\gamma_e \propto \gamma_e^{-p}$ for $\gamma_e \geq \gamma_{em}$, where γ_e is the electron Lorentz factor and $\gamma_{em} = 610\epsilon_e\gamma$ is the minimum Lorentz factor. We further assume that ϵ_e and ϵ_B are the electron and magnetic energy density fractions of the shocked medium respectively. The ν_m is the characteristic synchrotron frequency of an electron with Lorentz factor of γ_{em} , while the ν_c is the characteristic synchrotron frequency of an electron which cools on the dynamical age of the shock. According to Sari et al. (1998), therefore, these two frequencies, measured in the observer's frame, can be written as

$$\nu_m = \frac{\gamma_{em}^2}{1+z} \frac{eB'}{2\pi m_e c} = 7.0 \times 10^8 (\epsilon_e/0.1)^2 \epsilon_{B,-6}^{1/2} E_{52}^{1/2} t_\oplus^{-3/2} [(1+z)/2]^{1/2} \text{ Hz}, \quad (3)$$

$$\nu_c = \frac{18\pi e m_e c (1+z)}{\sigma_T^2 B^3 \gamma t_\oplus^2} = 2.2 \times 10^{17} \epsilon_{B,-6}^{-3/2} E_{52}^{-1/2} n_5^{-1} t_\oplus^{-1/2} [(1+z)/2]^{-1/2} \text{ Hz}, \quad (4)$$

where $\epsilon_{B,-6} = \epsilon_B/10^{-6}$, $B' = (32\pi\epsilon_B\gamma^2nm_p c^2)^{1/2}$ is the internal magnetic field strength of the shocked medium and σ_T is the Thompson scattering cross section. The self-absorption frequency has been estimated to be

$$\nu_a = 6.0 \times 10^{11} (\epsilon_e/0.1)^{-1} \epsilon_{B,-6}^{1/5} E_{52}^{1/5} n_5^{3/5} [(1+z)/2]^{-1} \text{ Hz}, \quad (5)$$

where $p = 2.8$ has been used (Granot, Piran & Sari 1998; Wijers & Galama 1998). This estimate is valid only for $\nu_a < \nu_m$. Since ν_m decreases as $\propto t_{\oplus}^{-3/2}$ and ν_a is time invariant, we define a time t_a based on $\nu_m(t_a) = \nu_a$:

$$t_a = 0.01 (\epsilon_e/0.1)^2 \epsilon_{B,-6}^{1/5} E_{52}^{1/5} n_5^{-2/5} [(1+z)/2] \text{ days}. \quad (6)$$

When $\nu_a > \nu_m$, the self-absorption coefficient $\alpha_\nu \propto \gamma \gamma_{em}^{p-1} B'^{(p+2)/2} \nu^{-(p+4)/2}$ (Rybicki & Lightman 1979) and the width of the shock $\Delta r \approx r/\gamma \propto \gamma t_{\oplus}$, so, based on the optical depth $\tau = \alpha_\nu \Delta r = 0.35$, we find that the self-absorption frequency decays as $\nu_a \propto t_{\oplus}^{-(3p+2)/2(p+4)}$. Thus we have

$$\nu_a = 6.0 \times 10^{11} (\epsilon_e/0.1)^{-1} \epsilon_{B,-6}^{1/5} E_{52}^{1/5} n_5^{3/5} [(1+z)/2]^{-1} (t_{\oplus}/t_a)^{-\frac{3p+2}{2(p+4)}} \text{ Hz}, \quad (7)$$

The observed synchrotron radiation peak flux can be obtained by

$$F_{\nu_m} = \frac{N_e \gamma P'_{\nu_m} (1+z)}{4\pi D_L^2} = 10 \epsilon_{B,-6}^{1/2} E_{52} n_5^{1/2} \left(\frac{\sqrt{1+z}-1}{\sqrt{2}-1} \right)^{-2} \text{ mJy}, \quad (8)$$

where N_e is the total number of swept-up electrons and $P'_{\nu_m} = m_e c^2 \sigma_T B' / (3e)$ is the radiated power per electron per unit frequency in the frame comoving with the shocked medium. For a flat universe with $H_0 = 65 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$, the distance to the source $D_L = 2c/H_0(1+z - \sqrt{1+z})$.

After having the peak flux and three break frequencies, we can write the spectrum and light curve of synchrotron radiation. For high frequency $\nu > \nu_{am} \equiv \max(\nu_a, \nu_m)$, we find

$$F_\nu = \begin{cases} (\nu/\nu_m)^{-(p-1)/2} F_{\nu_m} \propto \nu^{-(p-1)/2} t_{\oplus}^{3(1-p)/4} & \text{if } \nu_{am} < \nu < \nu_c \\ (\nu_c/\nu_m)^{-(p-1)/2} (\nu/\nu_c)^{-p/2} F_{\nu_m} \propto \nu^{-p/2} t_{\oplus}^{(2-3p)/4} & \text{if } \nu > \nu_c. \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

If $p \approx 2.8$, then the temporal decay index $\alpha = 3(1 - p)/4 \approx -1.35$ for emission from slow-cooling electrons or $\alpha = (2 - 3p)/4 \approx -1.6$ for emission from fast-cooling electrons. In addition, the low-frequency ($\nu < \nu_{am}$) radiation should be discussed in two cases: (i) for $\nu_a < \nu_m$, the spectrum and light curve can be written

$$F_\nu = \begin{cases} (\nu_a/\nu_m)^{1/3}(\nu/\nu_a)^2 F_{\nu_m} \propto \nu^2 t_\oplus^{1/2} & \text{if } \nu < \nu_a \\ (\nu/\nu_m)^{1/3} F_{\nu_m} \propto \nu^{1/3} t_\oplus^{1/2} & \text{if } \nu_a < \nu < \nu_m; \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

(ii) for $\nu_a > \nu_m$, we can obtain the spectrum and light curve,

$$F_\nu = (\nu_a/\nu_m)^{-(p-1)/2} (\nu/\nu_a)^{5/2} F_{\nu_m} \propto \nu^{5/2} t_\oplus^{5/4}. \quad (11)$$

These equations show that the flux of the low-frequency radiation increases with time.

2.2. Nonrelativistic Phase

After sweeping up sufficient ambient matter, the shock will eventually go into a non-relativistic phase, viz., $t_\oplus > t_b$. In the following we analyze the spectrum and light curve of the synchrotron radiation from such a shock, by assuming $\nu_a > \nu_m$.

2.2.1. Without Any Energy Injection

We first consider the widely-studied case without any energy to be input into the shock after the GRB. In this case, the shock's velocity $v \propto t_\oplus^{-3/5}$ and its radius $r \approx vt_\oplus \propto t_\oplus^{2/5}$. According to DL99, thus, the synchrotron peak frequency, the cooling frequency, the self-absorption frequency, and the peak flux are derived as

$$\nu_m = 7.0 \times 10^8 (\epsilon_e/0.1)^2 \epsilon_{B,-6}^{1/2} E_{52}^{1/2} t_b^{-3/2} [(1+z)/2]^{1/2} (t_\oplus/t_b)^{-3} \text{ Hz}, \quad (12)$$

$$\nu_c = 2.2 \times 10^{17} \epsilon_{B,-6}^{-3/2} E_{52}^{-1/2} n_5^{-1} t_b^{-1/2} [(1+z)/2]^{-1/2} (t_\oplus/t_b)^{-1/5} \text{ Hz}, \quad (13)$$

$$\nu_a = 6.0 \times 10^{11} (\epsilon_e/0.1)^{-1} \epsilon_{B,-6}^{1/5} E_{52}^{1/5} n_5^{3/5} [(1+z)/2]^{-1} (t_b/t_a)^{-\frac{3p+2}{2(p+4)}} (t_\oplus/t_b)^{-\frac{3p-2}{p+4}} \text{ Hz}, \quad (14)$$

and

$$F_{\nu_m} = 10\epsilon_{B,-6}^{1/2} E_{52} n_5^{1/2} \left(\frac{t_{\oplus}}{t_b} \right)^{3/5} \left(\frac{\sqrt{1+z}-1}{\sqrt{2}-1} \right)^{-2} \text{ mJy.} \quad (15)$$

Based on these equations, we further derive the spectrum and light curve,

$$F_{\nu} = \begin{cases} (\nu_a/\nu_m)^{-(p-1)/2} (\nu/\nu_a)^{5/2} F_{\nu_m} \propto \nu^{5/2} t_{\oplus}^{11/10} & \text{if } \nu < \nu_a \\ (\nu/\nu_m)^{-(p-1)/2} F_{\nu_m} \propto \nu^{-(p-1)/2} t_{\oplus}^{(21-15p)/10} & \text{if } \nu_a < \nu < \nu_c \\ (\nu_c/\nu_m)^{-(p-1)/2} (\nu/\nu_c)^{-p/2} F_{\nu_m} \propto \nu^{-p/2} t_{\oplus}^{(4-3p)/2} & \text{if } \nu > \nu_c. \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

We easily see that for high-frequency radiation the temporal decay index $\alpha = (21-15p)/10$ for emission from slow-cooling electrons or $\alpha = (4-3p)/2$ for emission from fast-cooling electrons. If $p \approx 2.8$, then $\alpha \approx -2.1$ or -2.2 . Comparing this with the relativistic result, we conclude that the afterglow decay steepens at the nonrelativistic stage.

2.2.2. With Energy Injection from Pulsars

Some models for GRB energy sources (for a brief review see Dai & Lu 1998c) predict that during the formation of an ultrarelativistic fireball required by GRB, a strongly magnetized millisecond pulsar will be born. If so, the pulsar will continuously input its rotational energy into the forward shock of the postburst fireball through magnetic dipole radiation because electromagnetic waves radiated by the pulsar will be absorbed in the shocked medium (Dai & Lu 1998a, c). Since an initially ultrarelativistic shock discussed in this paper rapidly becomes nonrelativistic in a dense medium, we next investigate the evolution of a nonrelativistic adiabatic shock with energy injection from a pulsar. The total energy of the shock is the sum of the initial energy and the energy which the shock has obtained from the pulsar:

$$E_0 + \int_0^{t_{\oplus}} L dt_{\oplus} = E_{\text{tot}} \propto v^2 r^3, \quad (17)$$

where L is the stellar spindown power $\propto (1 + t_{\oplus}/T)^{-2}$ (T is the initial spindown time scale). The term on the right-hand side is consistent with the Sedov solution. Please

note that L can be thought of as a constant for $t_{\oplus} < T$, while L decays as $\propto t_{\oplus}^{-2}$ for $t_{\oplus} \gg T$. Because of this feature, we easily integrate the second term on the left-hand side of equation (17). We now define a time at which the shock has obtained energy $\sim E_0$ from the pulsar, $t_c = E_0/L$, and assume $t_c \ll T$. We next analyze the evolution of the afterglow from such a shock at three stages.

First, at the initial stage, $t_{\oplus} \ll t_c$, viz., the second term on the left-hand side of equation (17) can be neglected. The evolution of the afterglow is the same as in the above case without any energy injection.

Second, for $T > t_{\oplus} \gg t_c$, the term E_0 in equation (17) can be neglected. At this stage, the shock's velocity $v \propto t_{\oplus}^{-2/5}$, its radius $r \propto t_{\oplus}^{3/5}$, the internal field strength $B' \propto t_{\oplus}^{-2/5}$ and the typical electron Lorentz factor $\gamma_{em} \propto t_{\oplus}^{-4/5}$. Thus, we obtain the synchrotron peak frequency $\nu_m \propto \gamma_{em}^2 B' \propto t_{\oplus}^{-2}$, the cooling frequency $\nu_c \propto B'^{-3} t_{\oplus}^{-2} \propto t_{\oplus}^{-4/5}$, the self-absorption frequency $\nu_a \propto t_{\oplus}^{-2(p-1)/(p+4)}$, and the peak flux $F_{\nu_m} \propto N_e P'_{\nu_m} \propto r^3 B' \propto t_{\oplus}^{7/5}$. According to these scaling laws, we derive the spectrum and light curve of the afterglow

$$F_{\nu} = \begin{cases} (\nu_a/\nu_m)^{-(p-1)/2} (\nu/\nu_a)^{5/2} F_{\nu_m} \propto \nu^{5/2} t_{\oplus}^{7/5} & \text{if } \nu < \nu_a \\ (\nu/\nu_m)^{-(p-1)/2} F_{\nu_m} \propto \nu^{-(p-1)/2} t_{\oplus}^{(12-5p)/5} & \text{if } \nu_a < \nu < \nu_c \\ (\nu_c/\nu_m)^{-(p-1)/2} (\nu/\nu_c)^{-p/2} F_{\nu_m} \propto \nu^{-p/2} t_{\oplus}^{2-p} & \text{if } \nu > \nu_c. \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

It can be seen that for high-frequency radiation the temporal decay index $\alpha = (12 - 5p)/5 \approx -0.4$ for emission from slow-cooling electrons or $\alpha = 2 - p \approx -0.8$ for emission from fast-cooling electrons if $p \approx 2.8$. This shows that the afterglow decay may significantly flatten due to the effect of the pulsar.

Third, for $t_{\oplus} \gg T$, the power of the pulsar due to magnetic dipole radiation rapidly decreases as $L \propto t_{\oplus}^{-2}$, and the evolution of the shock is hardly affected by the stellar radiation. Thus, the evolution of the afterglow at this stage will be the same as in the above case without any energy injection.

3. OBSERVED AND INFERRED PARAMETERS OF GRB 980519

We have shown that as an adiabatic shock expands in a dense medium from an ultra-relativistic phase to a nonrelativistic phase, the decay of radiation from such a shock will steepen, subsequently may flatten if a strongly magnetic millisecond pulsar continuously inputs its rotational energy into the shock through magnetic dipole radiation, and finally the decay will steepen again due to disappearance of the stellar effect. We next show that these effects can fit very well the observed afterglow of GRB 980519.

GRB 980519 was one of the brightest of the bursts detected by the BeppoSAX satellite (Muller et al. 1998; in 't Zand et al. 1999). The BATSE measured fluence above 25 keV was $(2.54 \pm 0.41) \times 10^{-5} \text{ ergs cm}^{-2}$, which places it among the top 12% of BATSE bursts (Connaughton 1998). An X-ray afterglow was detected by the BeppoSAX NFI (Nicastrro et al. 1999). The optical afterglow ~ 8.5 hours after the burst presented the most rapid fading of the well-detected GRB afterglows except for GRB 990510, consistent with $t_{\oplus}^{-2.05 \pm 0.04}$ in *BVRI* (Halpern et al. 1999), while the power-law decay index of the X-ray afterglow, $\alpha_X = 2.07 \pm 0.11$ (Owens et al. 1998), in agreement with the optical. The spectrum in optical band alone is well fitted by a power law $\nu^{-1.20 \pm 0.25}$, while the optical and X-ray spectra together can also be fitted by a single power law of the form $\nu^{-1.05 \pm 0.10}$. In addition, the radio afterglow of this burst was observed by the VLA at 8.3 GHz, and its temporal evolution $\propto t_{\oplus}^{0.9 \pm 0.3}$ between 1998 May 19.8UT and 22.3UT (Frail, Taylor & Kulkarni 1998).

We now analyze the observed afterglow data of GRB 980519 based on our model. We assume that for this burst, the forward shock evolved from an ultrarelativistic phase to a nonrelativistic phase in a dense medium at ~ 8 hr after the burst. So, the detected afterglow, in fact, was the radiation from a nonrelativistic shock. This implies $\gamma \sim 1$ at $t_b \approx 1/3$ days. From equation (2), therefore, we find

$$n_5 \sim 27 E_{52} [(1+z)/2]^3. \quad (19)$$

If $p \approx 2.8$, and if the observed optical afterglow was emitted by slow-cooling electrons and

the X-ray afterglow from fast-cooling electrons, then according to equation (16), the decay index $\alpha_R = (21 - 15p)/10 \approx -2.1$ and $\alpha_X = (4 - 3p)/2 \approx -2.2$, in excellent agreement with observations. Furthermore, the model spectral index at the optical to X-ray band and the decay index at the radio band, $\beta = -(p - 1)/2 \approx -0.9$ and $\alpha = 1.1$, are quite consistent with the observed ones, -1.05 ± 0.10 and 0.9 ± 0.3 , respectively.

We next continue to take into account three observational results. First, on May 21.6UT, the Keck II 10m telescope detected the R-band magnitude $R = 23.03 \pm 0.13$, corresponding to the flux $F_R \sim 3.5 \mu\text{Jy}$ at $t_{\oplus} \approx 2$ days (Gal et al. 1998). Considering this result in the second sub-equation of (16) together with equations (12), (15) and (19), we can derive

$$\epsilon_e^{1.8} \epsilon_{B,-6}^{0.95} E_{52}^{1.95} \left(\frac{1+z}{2} \right)^{1.95} \left(\frac{\sqrt{1+z}-1}{\sqrt{2}-1} \right)^{-2} \sim 1.7, \quad (20)$$

where $p \approx 2.8$ has been assumed.

Second, the BeppoSAX observed the X-ray (2-10 keV) flux $F_X \sim 1.3 \times 10^{-2} \mu\text{Jy}$ at $t_{\oplus} \approx 0.65$ days (Nicastro et al. 1999). Inserting this result into the third sub-equation of (16) together with equations (12), (13), (15) and (19), we can also derive

$$\epsilon_e^{1.8} \epsilon_{B,-6}^{0.2} E_{52}^{1.2} \left(\frac{1+z}{2} \right)^{0.7} \left(\frac{\sqrt{1+z}-1}{\sqrt{2}-1} \right)^{-2} \sim 0.14. \quad (21)$$

Third, the VLA detected the radio flux $F_{8.3\text{GHz}} \approx 102 \pm 19 \mu\text{Jy}$ on May 22.3UT in 1998 (Frail et al. 1998). This may result from the self-absorption effect in the shocked medium. Thus, combining it with the first sub-equation of (16) together with equations (12), (14), (15) and (19) leads to

$$\epsilon_e^{0.32} \epsilon_{B,-6}^{-0.24} E_{52}^{-1.28} \left(\frac{1+z}{2} \right)^{-0.26} \left(\frac{\sqrt{1+z}-1}{\sqrt{2}-1} \right)^{-2} \sim 3.2. \quad (22)$$

In addition, the total energy of the adiabatic shock, E_0 , is approximately equal to the

one released initially in gamma-rays (Piran 1999). This implies

$$E_{52} \sim 10 \left(\frac{1+z}{2} \right) \left(\frac{\sqrt{1+z}-1}{\sqrt{2}-1} \right)^2. \quad (23)$$

From equations (19)-(23), we infer intrinsic parameters of the shock and the redshift of the burst:

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_e &\sim 0.16, \quad \epsilon_{B,-6} \sim 280, \\ E_{52} &\sim 0.27, \quad n_5 \sim 3.4, \\ z &\sim 0.55. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

Our inferred value of ϵ_e is near the equipartition value, in agreement with the result of Wijers & Galama (1998) and Granot, Piran & Sari (1998), while our ϵ_B is also close to the value inferred from GRB 971214 and GRB 990123 (Wijers & Galama 1998; Galama et al. 1999; Wang et al. 1999a). After considering these reasonable parameters, Wang, Dai & Lu (1999b) numerically studied the trans-relativistic evolution of the shock and found that our dense medium model can provide an excellent fit to all the observational data of the radio afterglow from GRB 980519 shown in Frail et al. (1999).

If the late afterglow of GRB 980519 had still decayed according to equation (16), the inferred R-band fluxes on the 60th day and 66th day would have been nearly two orders of magnitude smaller than the observed values. This would lead to the argument that the emission on these two days came from the host galaxy of the burst (Sokolov et al. 1998; Bloom et al. 1998). We note that, despite of excellent seeing conditions on the Keck II telescope, Bloom et al. (1998) found little evidence for extension expected of a host galaxy. This implies that there may exist some mechanism by which the shock at the late stage had been renewed. As suggested in the above section, this mechanism is that a strongly magnetized millisecond pulsar had supplied its rotational energy to the shock through magnetic dipole radiation. We can see from the second sub-equation of (18) that when $t_c \ll t_{\oplus} < T$, the R-band afterglow decay index $\alpha_R = (12 - 5p)/5 \approx -0.4$, where $p \approx 2.8$ has been assumed. Combining this result with the observed flux $F_R \sim 0.2 \mu\text{Jy}$ on the 60th day and the decay power law in several days after the burst, we infer $t_c \sim 4$

days. According to the definition of $t_c = 29E_{52}B_{s,13}^{-2}P_{\text{ms}}^4$ days where $B_{s,13}$ is the surface magnetic field strength of the pulsar in units of 10^{13} G and P_{ms} is its initial period in units of 1 ms (Dai & Lu 1998a, c), we can obtain a constraint on the stellar parameters: $B_{s,13} \sim 2.7E_{52}^{1/2}P_{\text{ms}}^2 \sim 1.7P_{\text{ms}}^2$. Moreover, our model requires $T > 66$ days, which leads to $P_{\text{ms}} < 0.8$, where we have used the definition of the stellar spindown timescale, $T = 120B_{s,13}^{-2}P_{\text{ms}}^2$ days. Therefore, if GRB 980519 resulted from a pulsar, and if the property of the late afterglow was caused by the effect of the stellar magnetic dipole radiation, then this pulsar may be a strongly magnetized millisecond or even submillisecond one.

4. PROPERTIES OF OTHER BURSTS

4.1. GRB 990510

GRB 990510 was detected by the BeppoSAX Gamma-Ray Burst Monitor (Piro et al. 1999) as a bright and complex GRB composed by two well separated and multi-peaked pulses with a total duration of about 75 s (Amati et al. 1999). Its fluence was among the highest of the BeppoSAX localized events, after GRB 990123, GRB 980329 and GRB 970111. It was also detected by BATSE (Kippen et al. 1999) and its fluence (> 20 keV) was $(2.56 \pm 0.09) \times 10^{-5} \text{ erg cm}^{-2}$, in the top 9% of the BATSE burst fluence distribution. The burst appears at $z \geq 1.62$ (Vreeswijk et al. 1999), which leads to an isotropic energy of $\geq 1.4 \times 10^{53}$ ergs. The burst's afterglow was detected and monitored at X-ray and optical bands. Even though the X-ray afterglow decay light curve is not unlike that seen previous X-ray afterglow decays (Kuulkers et al. 1999), the optical afterglow displays its special feature: all the temporal decays at *VRI* bands steepened about 1.2 days after the burst (Harrison et al. 1999; Stanek et al. 1999; Bloom et al. 1999a; Marconi et al. 1999). Initially the optical decay index $\alpha_1 = -0.82 \pm 0.02$, but about 1.2 days later the index became $\alpha_2 = -2.18 \pm 0.05$. The consistency of α_1 , α_2 and the breaking time means that the breaking is wide band. This is the first clear observation of a wide band break (Bloom et al. 1999a; Harrison et al. 1999).

One simple interpretation for this steepening seems that we have been seeing evidence for a spreading jet (Rhoads 1999; Sari et al. 1999; Bloom et al. 1999a). As shown numerically in Panaitescu & Mészáros (1999), Moderski et al. (1999) and Huang et al. (1999b, 2000), however, the evolution of a spreading jet may not lead to a marked steepening. Another possible interpretation is that the effect of a strongly magnetized millisecond pulsar on the evolution of a nonrelativistic adiabatic shock in a dense medium has been becoming unimportant. If initially the pulsar was able to change the evolution of the shock for GRB 990510 through magnetic dipole radiation, and if the optical afterglow came from fast-cooling electrons in the shocked medium, then according to the second sub-equation of (18), the temporal decay index $\alpha = 2 - p \approx -0.82 \pm 0.02$. This requires $p \approx 2.8$, which is quite consistent with the value inferred from GRB 980519. When the effect of the pulsar on the shock disappeared, the optical afterglow decayed based on the third sub-equation of (16), viz., $\alpha = (4 - 3p)/2 \approx -2.2$, in excellent agreement with the observations. Furthermore, the observed breaking time should be equal to the stellar spindown timescale in our model, which constrains the pulsar's field strength: $B_{s,13} \sim 10P_{\text{ms}}$. Thus, the central engine of this burst could be a millisecond magnetar.

4.2. GRB 980326

The afterglow of GRB 980326 also had a rapid decline. Groot et al. (1998) derived a temporal decay index of $\alpha = -2.1 \pm 0.13$ and a spectral index of $\beta = -0.66 \pm 0.7$ in the optical band. This initial decay index, which is similar to that of GRB 980519, suggests the evolution of a nonrelativistic adiabatic shock in a dense medium. There is another observational result similar to the case of GRB 980519: the decay of the observed optical afterglow began to flatten about 5 days after the burst; this is not the contribution of the host galaxy because it is not present at a later time (Bloom & Kulkarni 1998; Bloom et al. 1999b). Consequently, the late afterglow might be interpreted as a different phenomenon. Bloom et al. (1999b) suggested that this late afterglow could result from

a supernova associating with GRB 980326. In our model, this is understood to be the emission from the nonrelativistic shock to which has been input energy by a strongly magnetized millisecond pulsar. According to the light curve shown in Figure 2 of Bloom et al. (1999b), we infer $t_c \sim 5$ days. Thus, the surface field strength of the pulsar could be $B_{s,13} \sim 2.4E_{52}^{1/2}P_{\text{ms}}^2$.

5. DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

There have been two kinds of plausible models for GRB energy sources in the literature: one relating to pulsars and another to stellar-mass black holes. Dai & Lu (1998c) have summarized possible progenitors involving strongly magnetic millisecond pulsars: accretion-induced collapses of magnetized white dwarfs, mergers of two neutron stars if the equation of state for neutron matter is moderately stiff to stiff, and phase transitions of neutron stars to strange stars. The pulsar progenitor models also include the birth of magnetars in supernova explosions suggested by Wheeler et al. (1999). The rotational energy of such pulsars at the moment of their formation is as high as a few $\times 10^{53}$ ergs. The efficiency of transformation of the rotational energy to the energy of a relativistic outflow and then to the energy of high-frequency radiation may be as high as almost 100% (Usov 1994; Blackman, Yi & Field 1996). Such pulsars have been suggested to generate possibly anisotropic outflows (Dai & Lu 1998a; Smolsky & Usov 1999), and thus may explain the energetics of GRBs, including GRB 990123 as an extreme event if the energy flux from the source at the line of sight is only about ten times more than the energy flux averaged over all directions. Two by-products in this kind of models are millisecond pulsars and relativistic forward shocks forming during the collision of the outflows with ambient media. It is natural to expect that the central pulsars affect the evolution of postburst shocks and in turn the afterglows from these shocks through magnetic dipole radiation.

In the second kind of GRB source models, Fryer, Woosley & Hartmann (1999) have

summarized possible progenitors involving black hole accretion disks: neutron star-neutron star binary mergers, black hole-neutron star mergers, black hole-white dwarf mergers, massive star core collapses, and black hole-helium star mergers. This kind of models should include the supranovae proposed by Vietri & Stella (1998).

Some of the source models mentioned above, e.g., failed supernovae (Woosley 1993), hypernovae (Paczynski 1998), supranovae (Vietri & Stella 1998), phase transitions of neutron stars to strange stars (Dai & Lu 1998a; DL99) and birth of magnetars (Wheeler et al. 1999), may lead to dense media prior to the occurrence of GRBs. In addition, dense media have also been discussed in the context of GRBs. For example, Katz (1994) suggested collisions of relativistic nucleons with a dense cloud as an explanation of the delayed hard photons from GRB 940217. DL99 discussed the evolution of an adiabatic shock in a dense medium to explain the steepening feature in the light curve of the R-band afterglow from GRB 990123.

Based on these arguments, following DL99, we discuss the evolution of an adiabatic shock expanding in a dense medium from an ultrarelativistic phase to a nonrelativistic phase in more details in this paper. In particular, we discuss the effects of synchrotron self absorption and energy injection on the afterglow from this shock. In a dense medium, the shock becomes nonrelativistic rapidly after a short relativistic phase. This transition time varies from several hours to a few days when the medium density is from 10^5 to a few $\times 10^6 \text{ cm}^{-3}$, and the shock energy from 10^{51} to 10^{54} ergs. The afterglow from the shock at the nonrelativistic stage decays more rapidly than at the relativistic stage, while the decay index varies from -1.35 to -2.1 if the spectral index of the accelerated electron distribution, $p = 2.8$, and the radiation comes from those slow-cooling electrons. Since some models mentioned above predict that a strongly magnetic millisecond pulsar may be born during the formation of GRB, we also discuss the effect of such a pulsar on the evolution of a nonrelativistic shock through magnetic dipole radiation, in contrast to the case discussed in Dai & Lu (1998a, c). We find that after the energy which the shock

obtains from the pulsar is much more than the initial energy of the shock, the afterglow decay will flatten significantly and the decay index will become -0.4 . When the pulsar energy input effect disappears, the index will still be -2.1 . These features are in excellent agreement with the afterglows of GRB 980519 and GRB 980326. Furthermore, our model fits very well all the observational data of GRB 980519 including the last two detections. Of course, if an afterglow of our interest comes from fast-cooling electrons in the shocked medium, the decay index of this afterglow will first be -1.6 during the relativistic phase and subsequently -2.2 at the nonrelativistic stage in the case of $p = 2.8$. If the energy input effect of the pulsar during this stage becomes very important, the decay index will be -0.8 . When this effect disappears, the index will become -2.2 again. The latter values of the index are quite consistent with the observations of GRB 990510. This requires that the time before the pulsar is able to affect the evolution of the shock is only as short as a few hours. It should be pointed out that whether and when a pulsar significantly affects the evolution of a shock largely depends upon the following three parameters: the shock's initial energy, the dipole magnetic field and period of the pulsar.

The flattening of the late optical afterglow light curves of GRB 980519 and GRB 980326 has also been interpreted as being due to Ib/c supernovae, which is based on the obvious reddening of the observed afterglow spectrum. In our model, this flattening is due to the energy input effect of millisecond pulsars through magnetic dipole radiation, and the expected afterglow spectrum would be the typical synchrotron spectrum without any dust effect. If dust exists in the vicinity of the pulsars, however, dust sublimation may lead to reddening of the afterglow spectrum as suggested by Waxman & Draine (1999). In explaining the steepening of the afterglow light curve of GRB 990510, we have envisioned the disappearance of the pulsar energy input effect. In our model, radio afterglows first brighten as $\propto t_{\oplus}^{5/4}$ with the pulsar energy input effect, and subsequently fade down as $\propto t_{\oplus}^{(4-3p)/2}$ when this effect becomes unimportant and the observed frequency is smaller than the synchrotron self-absorption frequency. Such a steepening has also been

understood to be due to the lateral expansion of relativistic jets (Rhoads 1999; Sari et al. 1999). Thus, radio afterglows from jets first decay as $\propto t_{\oplus}^{-1/3}$ and then as $\propto t_{\oplus}^{-p}$ (Sari et al. 1999). Therefore, there is an obvious difference in radio afterglow light curves between the pulsar energy input model and the jet model. We expect that future observations will provide evidence for or against the pulsar energy input model.

In summary, following DL99, we propose a model for several afterglows, in which a shock expanding in a dense medium evolves if its central engine is a strongly magnetized millisecond pulsar. We show that this model explains well the features of the afterglows from GRBs 980519, 980326 and 990510.

We would like to thank the anonymous referee for valuable comments and suggestions, and Y. F. Huang and D. M. Wei for helpful discussions. This work was supported partially by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (grants 19825109 and 19773007) and partially by the National 973 Project.

REFERENCES

- Amati, L., Frontera, F., Costa, E., & Feroci, M. 1999, GCN Circ. 317
- Blackman, E. G., Yi, I., & Field, G. B. 1996, ApJ, 473, L79
- Blandford, R. D., & McKee, C. F. 1976, Phys. Fluids, 19, 1130
- Bloom, J. S., & Kulkarni, S. R. 1998, GCN Circ. 161
- Bloom, J. S., Kulkarni, S. R., Djorgovski, S. G., Gal, R. R., Eichelberger, A., & Frail, D. A. 1998, GCN Circ. 149
- Bloom, J. S. et al. 1999a, GCN Circ. 323
- Bloom, J. S. et al. 1999b, Nature, 401, 453
- Castro-Tirado, A. J. et al. 1999, Science, 283, 2069
- Chiang, J., & Dermer, C. D. 1998, astro-ph/9803339
- Chevalier, R. A., & Li, Z. Y. 1999a, ApJ, 520, L29
- Chevalier, R. A., & Li, Z. Y. 1999b, astro-ph/9908272
- Cohen, E., Piran, T., & Sari, R. 1998, ApJ, 509, 717
- Connaughton, V. 1998, GCN Circ. 86
- Dai, Z. G., Huang, Y. F., & Lu, T. 1999, ApJ, 520, 634
- Dai, Z. G., & Lu, T. 1998a, Phys. Rev. Lett., 81, 4301
- Dai, Z. G., & Lu, T. 1998b, MNRAS, 298, 87
- Dai, Z. G., & Lu, T. 1998c, A&A, 333, L87
- Dai, Z. G., & Lu, T. 1999, ApJ, 519, L155 (DL99)
- Djorgovski, S. G. et al. 1997, Nature, 387, 876
- Frail, D. A., Taylor, G. B., & Kulkarni, S. R. 1998, GCN Circ. 89
- Frail, D. A., et al. 1999, ApJL, submitted (astro-ph/9910060)
- Fruchter, A. S. et al. 1999, ApJ, in press (astro-ph/9902236)
- Fryer, C. L., Woosley, S. E., & Hartmann, D. H. 1999, ApJ, submitted (astro-ph/9904122)
- Gal, R. R. et al. 1998, GCN Circ. 88
- Galama, T. J. et al. 1999, Nature, 398, 394
- Granot, J., Piran, T., & Sari, R. 1998, astro-ph/9808007
- Groot, P. J. et al. 1998, ApJ, 502, L123

- Halpern, J. P., Kemp, J., Piran, T., & Bershad, M. A. 1999, ApJ, submitted (astro-ph/9903418)
- Harrison, F. A. et al. 1999, astro-ph/9905306
- Huang, Y. F., Dai, Z. G., & Lu, T. 1998, A&A, 336, L69
- Huang, Y. F., Dai, Z. G., & Lu, T. 1999a, MNRAS, 309, 513
- Huang, Y. F., Dai, Z. G., Wei, D. M., & Lu, T. 1998, MNRAS, 298, 459
- Huang, Y. F., Gou, L. J., Dai, Z. G., & Lu, T. 1999b, ApJ, submitted (astro-ph/9910493)
- Huang, Y. F., Dai, Z. G., & Lu, T. 2000, MNRAS, submitted
- in 't Zand, J. J. M., Heise, J. van Paradijs, J., & Fenimore, E. E. 1998, ApJ, in press
- Katz, J. I. 1994, ApJ, 432, L27
- Katz, J. I., & Piran, T. 1997, ApJ, 490, 772
- Kippen, R. M. 1999, GCN Circ. 322
- Kulkarni, S. R. et al. 1999, Nature, 398, 389
- Kuulkers, E. et al. 1999, GCN Circ. 326
- Marconi, G., Israel, G. L., Lazzati, D., Covino, S., & Ghisellini, G. 1999, GCN Circ. 329
- Mészáros, P., & Rees, M. J. 1997, ApJ, 476, 232
- Mészáros, P., Rees, M. J., & Wijers, R. A. M. J. 1998, ApJ, 499, 301
- Moderski, R., Sikora, M., & Bulik, T. 1999, astro-ph/9904310
- Muller, J. M. et al. 1998, IAU Circ. 6910
- Nicastro, L. et al. 1999, A&A, in press (astro-ph/9904169)
- Owens, A. et al. 1998, A&A, 339, L37
- Paczynski, B. 1998, ApJ, 494, L45
- Panaitescu, A., & Mészáros, P. 1999, ApJ, in press (astro-ph/9806016)
- Panaitescu, A., Mészáros, P., & Rees, M. J. 1998, ApJ, 503, 315
- Piran, T. 1999, Phys. Rep., 314, 575
- Piro, L. et al. 1999, GCN Circ. 304
- Rees, M. J., & Mészáros, P. 1998, ApJ, 496, L1
- Reichart, D. E. 1997, ApJ, 485, L57
- Rhoads, J. 1999, ApJ, in press (astro-ph/9903399)

- Rybicki, G. B. & Lightman, A. P. 1979, *Radiative Processes in Astrophysics* (New York: Wiley)
- Sari, R. 1997, *ApJ*, 489, L37
- Sari, R., & Piran, T., & Halpern, J. P. 1999, *astro-ph/9903339*
- Sari, R., Piran, T., & Narayan, R. 1998, *ApJ*, 497, L17
- Smolsky, M. V., & Usov, V. V. 1999, *astro-ph/9905142*
- Sokolov, V., Zharikov, S., Palazzi, L., & Nicastro, L. 1998, *GCN Circ.*148
- Stanek, K. Z. et al. 1999, *astro-ph/9905304*
- Usov, V. V. 1994, *MNRAS*, 267, 1035
- Vietri, M. 1997, *ApJ*, 488, L105
- Vietri, M., & Stella, L. 1998, *ApJ*, 507, L45
- Vreeswijk, P. M. et al. 1999, *GCN Circ.* 324
- Wang, X. Y., Dai, Z. G., & Lu, T. 1999a, *MNRAS*, submitted (*astro-ph/9906062*)
- Wang, X. Y., Dai, Z. G., & Lu, T. 1999b, *MNRAS*, submitted (*astro-ph/9912492*)
- Waxman, E. 1997a, *ApJ*, 485, L5
- Waxman, E. 1997b, *ApJ*, 489, L33
- Waxman, E., & Draine, B. T. 1999, *ApJ*, submitted (*astro-ph/9909020*)
- Waxman, E., Kulkarni, S. R., & Frail, D. A. 1998, *ApJ*, 497, 288
- Wheeler, J. C., Yi, I., Höflich, P., & Wang, L. 1999, *ApJ*, in press
- Wijers, R. A. M. J., & Galama, T. J. 1998, *ApJ*, in press (*astro-ph/9805341*)
- Wijers, R. A. M. J., Rees, M. J., & Mészáros, P. 1997, *MNRAS*, 288, L51
- Woosley, S. 1993, *ApJ*, 405, 273
- Zharikov, S. V., Sokolov, V. V., & Baryshev, Yu V. 1998, *A&A*, 337, 356